

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figure 14 is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. The drawing Figure 14 have been amended. Appended to this amendment is an annotated copy of the previous drawing sheet which has been marked to show changes presented in the replacement sheet of the drawing.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 2-4, 6-9 and 13-15 are currently being amended.

Claim 17 is currently being added.

This amendment amends and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and adding the claims as set forth above, claims 1-17 are now pending in this application.

Objection to Drawings:

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because Figure 14 should have a "Prior Art" label. By way of this amendment and reply, a replacement formal drawing sheet for Figure 14, with a "Prior Art" label, is being submitted.

Objection to Specification:

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to because of an informality on page 2, line 7. By way of this amendment and reply, that informality has been corrected. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,028,577 to Sakamoto. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claim 1, the Office Action asserts the left-side element 7a as shown in Figure 7 of Sakamoto corresponds to the claimed first electrostatic shielding unit, and that the right-side element 7a as shown in Figure 7 of Sakamoto corresponds to the claimed second electrostatic shielding unit. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, as described in column 13 of Sakamoto, elements 7a as shown in Figure 7 of Sakamoto

correspond to ‘fixed potential electrodes’, whereby they “have a function of increasing the storage capacitance of the corresponding pixel electrodes 1.” See column 13, lines 29-31 of Sakamoto.

Thus, the elements 7a of Sakamoto do not correspond functionally and in operation to the claimed first and second electrostatic shielding units which shield pixel electrodes from an electric field produced by a data line that is adjacent the pixel electrodes.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Sakamoto.

In its rejection of claim 2, which has now been placed in independent form, the Office Action asserts that Sakamoto discloses a second switching device [Fig. 10B; 6(i, j-1)] that is electrically connected between the gate electrode of the first switching device and a predetermined scan line. However, even if element 6(i, j-1) of Sakamoto could be considered to correspond to the claimed second switching device, that element 6(i, j-1) is connected to the same scan line 2(i) as the so-called first switching device 6(i, j), as seen in Fig. 10B of Sakamoto, and is not connected between a gate electrode of element 6(i, j) and a predetermined scan line.

In contrast, referring now to Figure 4 of the drawings, which shows an exemplary configuration of features recited in claim 2, a second switching device [M2] is electrically connected between the gate electrode of a first switching device [M1] and a predetermined scan line [G_{n+1}]. Such features are not disclosed or suggested by Sakamoto.

Accordingly, claim 2 is not anticipated by Sakamoto.

Regarding Claims 3-7 and 9-11, those claims depend either directly or indirectly from claim 2, and thus those claims are patentable due to the reasons provided above for claim 2, as well as for the specific features recited in those claims.

Regarding claim 8, which has been placed in independent form, Sakamoto discloses, at best, that an electrically conductive film 7 for the fixed-potential electrodes 7a and 7b is the same as an electrically conductive film used for forming the scanning lines 2. See column 13, lines 45-47 of Sakamoto. In other words, Sakamoto merely discloses that the material of the electrodes 7a and 7b is the same as the material of the scanning lines 2. It is clear that the electrodes 7a and 7b are separate from the scanning lines 2, as shown in Figure 7 of

Sakamoto. Thus, the electrodes 7a and 7b of Sakamoto are not connected to the scanning lines 2.

Accordingly, Sakamoto does not disclose or suggest that a first electrostatic shielding unit and a second electrostatic shielding unit are connected to a predetermined scan line, as explicitly recited in claim 8.

Regarding claim 13, that claim has been amended to include the features of its base claim. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 2, claim 13 is not anticipated by Sakamoto.

Regarding claim 14, that claim has been amended to include the features of its base claim. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 8, claim 14 is not anticipated by Sakamoto. Claim 15 has been amended to depend from claim 13. For the same reasons as provided above with respect to claim 13, claim 14 is not anticipated by Sakamoto.

Regarding claim 12, for the same reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1, claim 12 is not anticipated by Sakamoto.

New Claim:

New claim 17 has been added, whereby support for the features recited in that claim may be found, for example, in Figure 4 of the drawings and in the description of that figure in the specification. Such features as recited in claim 17 are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by Sakamoto.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 8, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5300

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola

Glenn Law

Registration No. 34,371

Phillip J. Articola

Registration No. 38,819



FIG.14

Prior Art

